REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating allowable subject matter.

Claims 1, 3-13, and 31-38 are pending in the application. Claims 4, 5, 9 and 36-38 are allowed. Claims 3, 31-33 and 35 are amended herein and made allowable according to the Examiner's recommendations. Claim 34 is not amended herein, but is believed allowable through dependence from amended Claim 3. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of all remaining claims.

1. Response to Rejections Under 35 USC § 103

In part 2 of the Office Action ("O/A"), Claims 1, 6-8, and 10-13 stand rejected for obviousness over USP 5,991,546 ("*Chan*") in view of USP 5,778,312 ("*Kawashima*") and USP 5,760,699 ("*Saka*").

For a claim to be obvious, there must be: (a) a suggestion or motivation to combine reference teachings; (b) a reasonable expectation of success; and (c) the references must teach all of the claim limitations. MPEP § 706.02(j); *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 U.S.P.Q.2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). In the present case, the obviousness rejections are unsustainable because no combination of *Chan*, *Kawashima* and *Saka* teaches every limitation of any independent claim. Specifically, no combination of these references teaches a peripheral device turning on a power supply to a main unit when that power supply is off, and when turned on, enabling the main unit to discover which of many peripheral devices issued the power on command.

In a system according to the present invention, when an incoming signal from a telephone unit or an abnormal state detection signal from a security unit is detected, the system issues a wakeup signal to a main unit. Receiving the wakeup signal, the power of the main unit in a sleep state is turned on. The present invention not only allows a peripheral device to turn on power to

the main unit, but also allows the main unit to identify, after power-on, the peripheral device that issued the wakeup request. Moreover, the device that detects a predetermined condition justifying a wakeup is separate from the device to be powered on (*i.e.* the main unit). In these respects, the present invention adopts a novel signal detection scheme over the prior art.

a. The "main unit" of the automotive information system according to the present invention includes a computer that performs overall control of the whole system.

As a preliminary matter, it is important to acknowledge Applicant's definition of the term "main unit," which is recited in every claim. In the present application, a main unit of the automotive information system is one that "conducts overall control of the whole system and a plurality of component devices or units connected to the main unit." Application, p.22, ln. 1-3. An exemplary main unit in FIG. 1 incorporates a "controlling computer that performs overall control of the whole system." Application, p.22, ln. 17-19. Thus, the main unit may be thought of as including a central controller or host computer for the automotive information system.

b. *Chan.* fails to teach a means for turning on a power supply to the main unit

Regarding Claim 1, the O/A on p.2 credits *Chan* as teaching a means for turning on a power supply to the main unit in response to a start signal. For support, the O/A cites to *Chan*, col.5, ln. 5-55. However, all that *Chan* discloses here is a means for interfacing a keyboard 10 and mouse 12 with a USB 14 for communicating with a host computer 16. In order for either of these input devices 10 and 12 to operate, the host computer 16 must already be powered on.

Generally speaking, a USB device (such as keyboard 10 or mouse 12) utilizes power *supplied* from a host device via USB, as power for driving the device itself. Such a device constitutes a system in which, upon connection of the device to the bass power source, power is supplied to the device itself, and in addition, the device resets itself with the power fed thereto to

send a notification to a host controller via a USB so that the host implements connection authentication processing for the device. Therefore, unlike the present invention, the host side controller in a USB system such as *Chan* needs to be constantly in an active state to monitor any device connection.

Thus, *Chan* fails to teach a means for turning on a power supply to a main unit in response to a start signal, as claimed. Because the O/A cannot rely on *Chan* as teaching this element, and because no other reference is credited with teaching this element, the obviousness rejection of Claim 1 and its dependents should be withdrawn on this basis alone.

c. *Kawashima* fails to teach sending a start signal to the main unit when a predetermined condition is satisfied.

Regarding Claim 1, the O/A on pp. 2-3 credits *Kawashima* as teaching a means for sending a start signal to a main unit when detecting that a predetermined condition has been satisfied. For support, the O/A cites generally to *Kawashima*, cols.1-3 and col.5. However, *Kawashima* cannot be so credited. *Kawashima* does not teach sending a start signal to the main unit; *Kawashima*'s signal merely switches power on and off to a radio receiving unit within the main unit. *See Kawashima*, FIG. 1 item 2, and col.2, ln. 45-53. *Kawashima*'s power circuit 3 is the main power supply for the whole system, and it must be turned on administratively, and independently of the system detecting any predetermined condition. *See Kawashima*, col.2, ln.52-53.

Kawashima has an objective completely different from that of the present invention. *Kawashima*'s system switches power only to the radio receiving unit 2 in a predetermined pattern at a control section in order to conserve power. *Kawashima*, col.1, ln. 33-37; col. 4, ln.25-50. Unlike the present invention, *Kawashima* does not control power to the whole system

based on detecting a predetermined condition introduced by an external factor. Under a detected condition, *Kawashima* simply gives a call page notification. *Kawashima* col.1, ln.50-52.

In sum, there is no teaching or suggestion in *Kawashima* to control power to a main unit based on detecting whether a predetermined condition has been satisfied. Because the O/A cannot rely on *Kawashima* as teaching this element, and because no other reference is credited with teaching this element, the obviousness rejection of Claim 1 and its dependents should be withdrawn on this basis alone.

d. *Saka* is irrelevant to the present claims, and fails to teach a main unit querying a peripheral device after main unit power-up.

Regarding Claim 1, the O/A on p.3 cites generally to *Saka's* teachings related to receiving paging signals. In summarizing the teachings of *Saka*, the O/A states on p.4 that a combination of *Saka, Kawashima* and *Chan* would "*provide a radio communication apparatus that can effectively detect a transmission stop period by detecting the presence or absence of a preamble pattern.*" Regardless of the veracity of that statement, it has nothing whatsoever to do with Claim 1 of the present invention. Claim 1 is not claiming, and indeed the invention is not concerned with, detecting transmission stop periods and preamble patterns.

Neither *Saka* nor any other cited reference teaches or suggests a main unit that, when turned on in response to a start signal from a peripheral device, inquires from the peripheral device whether the peripheral device sent the start signal. Neither *Saka* nor any other cited reference teaches or suggests a peripheral device that, having been so queried, has a means for answering the inquiry. These limitations are recited in Claim 1, thus, the lack of citation to prior art suggesting these limitations is fatal to the obviousness rejection. Accordingly, the obviousness rejection of Claim 1 and its dependents should be withdrawn on this basis alone.

e. Claims 6-7 are allowable over the cited art

On p.4 of the O/A, the O/A cites to *Chan* (col. 5, ln. 5-55) as teaching the following elements of Claim 6: "enabling said device to detect that a predetermined condition has been satisfied," and "causing said device to send a start signal to said main unit when the satisfaction of said predetermined condition is detected." However, the Examiner already admitted that *Chan* does not teach these features, both in the present O/A on p.2, and also in the O/A of April 22, 2005 on p.3. Indeed, there are no such teaching in *Chan*. *Chan* is concerned with interfacing a keyboard and mouse with a USB for communicating with a host computer, as explained above. Since these elements of Claims 6-7 are not taught by *Chan*, and because the O/A relies solely on *Chan* as teaching these elements, the obviousness rejections should be withdrawn.

In the remainder of the rejection of Claims 6-7, the O/A cites the same sections of *Kawashima* and *Saka* that were cited in the rejection of Claim 1. Applicant notes that the method steps of Claim 6 correspond closely to elements of Claim 1. Therefore, Claims 6-7 are allowable for the same reasons presented above regarding the allowability of Claim 1.

f. The Office Action does not present a prima facie rejection of Claim 8.

On p.6 of the O/A, the O/A cites to *Chan* identically as in the rejections of previous claims. Contrary to this citation, *Chan* fails to teach multiple limitations of Claim 8. *Chan* is directed to interfacing devices such as a keyboard and mouse to a host computer via a USB. *Chan* neither teaches nor suggests any methods for controlling an automotive information system having a main unit, a security control unit, and a wireless telephone.

None of the citations to *Chan* discuss anything remotely related to the elements of Claim 8: (i) enabling a security control unit to sense an extraordinary event, (ii) causing the security control system to send a start signal to the main unit when the extraordinary event is sensed, (iii)

enabling the main unit to detect a start signal, and (iv) enabling the main unit to turn on a power supply to the main unit in response to the start signal. As discussed above in section 1.b., *Chan's* host computer must already be powered on in order for peripheral devices such as the keyboard and mouse to effect communications via the USB. Thus, the sensing, causing, and enabling elements of Claim 8, all of which are involved in powering on the main unit, are elements that are not taught by *Chan* under any reasonable interpretation thereof. Since the rejection of Claim 8 relies solely on *Chan* as teaching these elements, the obviousness rejection should be withdrawn.

In the remainder of the rejection of Claim 8, the O/A cites sections of *Kawashima* and *Saka* which have been demonstrated above not to teach or suggest elements of the present invention that are present in Claim 8. Furthermore, Applicant notes that elements of claim 8 not present in previous claims, such as causing the main unit to send a notification request signal to the wireless telephone unit, etc., are merely acknowledged in the O/A but not addressed by the O/A in any meaningful way that would constitute a prima facie rejection. On this basis alone, Applicant requests allowance of Claim 8.

g. Claims 10-11 and 13 are allowable over the cited art

Claims 10-11 and Claim 13 contain limitations similar to Claim 1 that are not taught or suggested by any combination of the cited art. Specifically, the limitations wherein a main unit includes a means for turning on a power supply to the main unit in response to a start signal, and a means for inquiring, when the power supply is turned on in response to said start signal, whether the peripheral device sent the start signal. No combination of *Chan, Kawashima,* and *Saka* (the basis for this rejection) teaches these limitations, as demonstrated above in sections 1.b. and 1.d.

h. The Office Action does not present a prima facie rejection of Claim 12

On p. 9 of the O/A, Claim 12 is rejected for obviousness based on *Chan, Kawashima,* and *Saka.* However, none of the limitations of Claim 12 are addressed in the rejection. Claim 12 recites a device comprising a (i) detecting means, (ii) a sending means, and (iii) an answering means. In the rejection of Claim 12, the O/A lists a series of limitations presumably taught by *Chan*, such as a cable, a first power line, and a data line. These features are irrelevant to Claim 12; therefore no prima facie rejection of Claim 12 is present. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the obviousness rejection of Claim 12 be withdrawn.

2. Conclusion

In view of all of the above, Applicant believes that the case is now in condition for allowance and early notification of the same is requested. If the Examiner believes that a telephone interview will help further the prosecution of this case, he is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the listed telephone number.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to the USPTO at **571-273-8300** on August 14, 2006.

By: Candy Neu

Signature

Dated: August 14, 2006

Very truly yours,

SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.

Joseph W. Price
Registration No. 25,124
600 Anton Boulevard, Suite 1400
Costa Mesa, California 92626-7689
Telephone: (714) 427-7420
Facsimile: (714) 427-7799